

Message Text

PAGE 01 NATO 03260 01 OF 02 131626Z

44

ACTION ACDA-10

INFO OCT-01 EUR-12 ISO-00 ACDE-00 ERDA-05 CIAE-00 H-02

INR-07 IO-10 L-03 NSAE-00 OIC-02 OMB-01 PA-01 PM-03

PRS-01 SAJ-01 SAM-01 SP-02 SS-15 USIA-06 TRSE-00

NSC-05 BIB-01 /089 W

----- 032900

P R 131510Z JUN 75

FM USMISSION NATO

TO SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 2284

SECDEF WASHDC PRIORITY

INFO USDEL MBFR VIENNA PRIORITY

AMEMBASSY BONN

AMEMBASSY LONDON

USNMR SHAPE

USCINCEUR

S E C R E T SECTION 1 OF 2 USNATO 3260

E.O. 11652: GDS

TAGS: PARM, NATO

SUBJECT: MBFR: TIME BETWEEN PHASES: SPC MEETING JUNE 12

REFS: A) STATE 110784; B) USNATO 3231 DTG 111820Z JUNE 75

SUMMARY. AT SPC MEETING JUNE 12, BELGIUM AND FRG QUESTIONED USE OF GUIDANCE PROPOSED BY U.S. ON TIME BETWEEN PHASES WITH EAST AT THIS TIME.; NEW MOVEMENT IN THE NEGOTIATION UNLESS ABSOLUTELY NECESSARY, PRIOR TO AN OPTION III

OFFER TO EAST. FRG REP SAID THE OTHER SIDE WILL NOT MOVE UNTIL INTRODUCTION OF OPTION III, AND THAT THE ALLIES MIGHT CONSIDER THE U.S. PROPOSAL ON PHASING AS A POSSIBLE POST-OPTION III OFFER TO THE EAST. HE SAID FRG CONCERN WITH U.S. PROPOSAL ON PHASING WAS NOW MORE WITH TIMING THAN SUBSTANCE, BUT FRG CONCERN WITH SUBSTANCE REMAINS. THIS MESSAGE CONTAINS OUR VIEWS ON NEXT STEPS RE THE U.S. PROPOSAL ON TIME BETWEEN PHASES, AND REQUESTS GUIDANCE
SECRET

PAGE 02 NATO 03260 01 OF 02 131626Z

IN TIME FOR SPC MEETING THURSDAY, JUNE 19 (EARLIER IF POSSIBLE TO ALLOW CONSULTATION WITH OTHER DELEGATIONS). END SUMMARY.

1. SPC ON JUNE 12 AGAIN CONSIDERED U.S. PROPOSAL TO SHORTEN THE

TIME BETWEEN PHASES (REF A).

2. BELGIAN REP (WILLOT) STATED THAT SINCE THE ALLIES ARE NOW EXAMINING OPTION III, AND MIGHT DECIDE TO USE IT WITH THE EAST, THE ALLIES SHOULD NOT MAKE ANY MOVEMENT IN THE NEGOTIATION UNLESS ABSOLUTELY NECESSARY UNTIL THAT TIME. ANY ALLIED CONCESSION OFFERED TO THE EAST IN ADVANCE OF OPTION III COULD BE WASTED.

3. U.S. REP (MOORE) SAID THAT THE U.S. PROPOSAL ON PHASING WOULD ADVANCE ALLIED NEGOTIATING OBJECTIVES, AND THERE WAS NO REASON TO DELAY ITS USE WITH THE EAST. HE POINTED OUT THAT THE U.S. PROPOSAL ON TIME BETWEEN PHASES IS NOT A CONCESSION: IT WOULD IN FACT REQUIRE SOVIET AGREEMENT TO A PRECISE TIME FOR IMPLEMENTATION OF PHASE I REDUCTIONS, AND A SHORTER TIME FOR IMPLEMENTATION OF REDUCTIONS THAN IS IN THE PRESENT GUIDANCE.

IF THE SOVIETS VIOLATED THIS PRECISE COMMITMENT, ALLIES WOULD BE IN GOOD POSITION WITH PUBLIC OPINION TO STALL PHASE II NEGOTIATIONS. ALLIES THUS SHOULD BE ABLE TO OFFER SHORTER TIME BETWEEN PHASES TO THE OTHER SIDE, WHICH WOULD MAKE PHASING MORE ATTRACTIVE TO OTHER SIDE AND ADVANCE ALLIED OBJECTIVES ON PHASING.

4. BELGIAN REP STATED THERE WAS NO NEED FOR ALLIES TO SEEK SOVIET AGREEMENT AT THIS TIME TO A PRECISE PERIOD FOR IMPLEMENTATION FOR PHASE I REDUCTIONS. EVERYONE KNEW THERE WOULD HAVE TO BE A PRECISE COMMITMENT ON PERIOD FOR IMPLEMENTATION OF PHASE I REDUCTIONS IN THE FINAL MBFR AGREEMENT. U.S. REP POINTED OUT THAT NOBODY HAD PROPOSED THIS UNTIL NOW. THE U.S. WAS NOW PROPOSING IT IN A WAY WHICH WOULD FURTHER ALLIED OBJECTIVES ON PHASING.

5. FRG REP (HOYNCK) SAID FRG REGARDED THE U.S. PROPOSAL AS A "SOMEWHAT IMPORTANT CONCESSION" TO THE EAST. HE NOTED THE SECTION IN THE U.S. PAPER ON OPTION III REGARDING MODIFICATION OF THE PHASING CONCEPT. HE SAID THAT THE TIME BETWEEN PHASES EVENTUALLY HAS TO BE DISCUSSED, HOWEVER, THE
SECRET

PAGE 03 NATO 03260 01 OF 02 131626Z

ALLIES DO NOT YET KNOW THE DURATION OF THE PERIOD BETWEEN SIGNATURE AND ENTRY INTO FORCE OF THE AGREEMENT. THIS WILL DEPEND IN PART ON HOW MANY COUNTRIES HAVE TO RATIFY THE AGREEMENT. THE TIME BETWEEN PHASES WILL ALSO DEPEND ON THE CONTENT OF THE FIRST PHASE AGREEMENT, ON WHICH THERE IS NOT YET AN ALLIED POSITION.

6. UK REP (BAILES) SAID UK WOULD WANT TO CONSIDER ANY PROPOSALS FOR NEW GUIDANCE ON THEIR OWN MERIT, IRRESPECTIVE OF STATE OF WORK ON OPTION III. NETHERLANDS REP (MEESMAN) AGREED.

7. FRG REP SAID THAT THE ALLIES WOULD NOT BUY SOVIET AGREEMENT TO PHASING SIMPLY WITH THE U.S. PROPOSAL TO SHORTEN THE TIME

BETWEEN PHASES. THE AHG HAS SAID THAT THE OTHER SIDE WILL NOT MOVE UNTIL INTRODUCTION OF OPTION III. THE ALLIES MAY WELL NEED TO ADD SOMETHING TO OPTION III TO GAIN THEIR OBJECTIVES. THE ALLIES MIGHT CONSIDER THE U.S. PROPOSAL TO SHORTEN THE TIME BETWEEN PHASES AS A POSSIBLE, POST-OPTION III OFFER TO THE EAST.

8. U.S. REP ASKED IF FRG REP'S REMARKS AT THIS MEETING INDICATED THAT FRG CONCERN WITH THE U.S. PROPOSAL WAS NOW MORE ON TIMING OF ITS USE WITH THE EAST, THAN ON SUBSTANCE. HE ALSO NOTED THAT THE U.S. PROPOSAL DID NOT REPRESENT A MODIFICATION OF THE PHASING CONCEPT.

SECRET

PAGE 01 NATO 03260 02 OF 02 131720Z

44

ACTION ACDA-10

INFO OCT-01 EUR-12 ISO-00 ACDE-00 ERDA-05 CIAE-00 H-02

INR-07 IO-10 L-03 NSAE-00 OIC-02 OMB-01 PA-01 PM-03

PRS-01 SAJ-01 SAM-01 SP-02 SS-15 USIA-06 TRSE-00

NSC-05 BIB-01 /089 W

----- 033483

P R 131510Z JUN 75

FM USMISSION NATO

TO SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 2285

SECDEF WASHDC PRIORITY

INFO USDEL MBFR VIENNA PRIORITY

AMEMBASSY BONN

AMEMBASSY LONDON

USNMR SHAPE

USCINCEUR

S E C R E T SECTION 2 OF 2 USNATO 3260

9. FRG REP REPLIED THAT FRG CONCERN WAS NOW MORE WITH TIMING THAN SUBSTANCE, BUT FRG CONCERN WITH SUBSTANCE REMAINS.

10. CHAIRMAN (KASTL) SUGGESTED THAT ALLIES MIGHT WORK ON SUBSTANCE OF U.S. PROPOSAL, WITH IDEA THAT IT WOULD BE PLAYED WITH THE EAST AT A LATER DATE.

11. SPC RETURNS TO THE U.S. PROPOSAL ON TIME BETWEEN PHASES ON THURSDAY, JUNE 19.

12. COMMENT: WE BELIEVE THAT IN LIGHT OF JUNE 9 (REF B) AND JUNE 12 SPC MEETINGS, U.S. SHOULD NOW DECIDE NEXT STEPS IT WISHES TO TAKE ON PHASING.

13. AT JUNE 9 SPC MEETING, FRG TOOK A FIRM POSITION AGAINST SUBSTANCE OF U.S. PROPOSALS TO SHORTEN THE TIME BETWEEN PHASES. ESSENCE OF FRG ARGUMENT ON SUBSTANCE IS THAT IMPLEMENTATION OF SOVIET PHASE I WITHDRAWALS MUST TAKE PLACE BEFORE BEGINNING OF SECRET

PAGE 02 NATO 03260 02 OF 02 131720Z

PHASE II NEGOTIATIONS, BECAUSE, IF SOVIETS DELAYED THOSE WITHDRAWALS, THE ALLIES WOULD NOT BE POLITICALLY ABLE TO STALL PHASE II NEGOTIATIONS. HOWEVER, FRG AT JUNE 12 MEETING, AS NOTED ABOVE, DID NOT ADDRESS SUBSTANCE, BUT CONCENTRATED ON TIMING, AND INDICATED WILLINGNESS TO CONSIDER U.S. PROPOSAL AS A POSSIBLE ADDITION TO POST-OPTION III ALLIED POSITION. MISSION NOTES THAT FRG IS NOT ISOLATED RE U.S. PROPOSAL, SINCE FRG HAS RECEIVED SUPPORT FROM BOTH BELGIUM AND ITALY. NEVERTHELESS, UK, CANADA AND NETHERLANDS STRONGLY SUPPORT U.S. PROPOSAL, AND WE WOULD JUDGE THAT MOVEMENT IN FRG POSITION IS POSSIBLE.

14. WE SUGGEST ONE MODIFICATION OF U.S. PROPOSAL WHICH MIGHT HELP MEET FRG CONCERN ON SUBSTANCE. WE SUGGEST ADDING A PARA 3 C TO THE DRAFT GUIDANCE TO AHG (PARA 3, REF A) TO READ AS FOLLOWS: "THE ALLIED NEGOTIATORS ARE ALSO AUTHORIZED TO POINT OUT TO THE EAST THAT, IN ANY EVENT, IMPLEMENTATION OF PHASE I REDUCTIONS WOULD HAVE TO BE COMPLETED BEFORE SIGNATURE OF AN EVENTUAL PHASE II AGREEMENT." IF THE ALLIES AGREED TO THIS LANGUAGE, IT WOULD IN EFFECT COMMIT THEM FORMALLY TO STALL THE PHASE II NEGOTIATIONS IF THE SOVIETS DELAYED IMPLEMENTATION OF PHASE I WITHDRAWALS. THIS SHOULD HELP OVERCOME FRG CONCERN THAT THE ALLIES WOULD NOT REALLY BE PREPARED TO DELAY THE PROGRESS OF PHASE II NEGOTIATIONS IF THE SOVIETS DELAYED THEIR PHASE I REDUCTIONS. WE NOTE THAT NETHERLANDS AUTHORITIES HAVE ALREADY TAKEN THE POSITION THAT IT IS MOST UNLIKELY THAT THE ALLIES WOULD INITIAL A PHASE II AGREEMENT PRIOR TO FULL IMPLEMENTATION OF PHASE I WITHDRAWALS (PARA 3, REF B). IT SEEMS TO US THAT MODIFICATION OF THE U.S. PROPOSAL ALONG THESE LINES SHOULD ENABLE US TO DETERMINE HOW FAR THE FRG IS WILLING TO MOVE ON SUBSTANCE AT THIS TIME. IF SPC REACHED AGREEMENT ON THE SUBSTANTIVE ISSUE, IT COULD THEN ADDRESS FRG AND BELGIAN RESERVATIONS ON TIMING OF USE OF NEW GUIDANCE ON PHASING WITH OTHER SIDE.

15. WASHINGTON WILL ALSO WISH TO CONSIDER WHETHER THE U.S. PROPOSAL ON PHASING IS SUFFICIENTLY IMPORTANT AND TIMELY FOR NATO WORK AT THE SAME TIME THE ALLIANCE IS WORKING ON OPTION III. WE WOULD JUDGE THAT CONTINUATION OF THE U.S. PROPOSAL ON PHASING ON SPC AGENDA FOR NEXT FEW MEETINGS WILL NOT REQUIRE MUCH SECRET

PAGE 03 NATO 03260 02 OF 02 131720Z

EXPENDITURE OF TIME BY SPC OR MBFR DECISION MAKERS IN CAPITALS.
NATO CAN CONSIDER OTHER U.S. PROPOSALS ON MBFR WHILE WORK ON
OPTION III IS GOING ON. END COMMENT.

16. ACTION REQUESTED: GUIDANCE, IN LIGHT OF ABOVE COMMENT,
IN TIME FOR SPC MEETING THURSDAY, JUNE 19. STREATOR

SECRET

<< END OF DOCUMENT >>

Message Attributes

Automatic Decaptioning: X
Capture Date: 18 AUG 1999
Channel Indicators: n/a
Current Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Concepts: n/a
Control Number: n/a
Copy: SINGLE
Draft Date: 13 JUN 1975
Decaption Date: 01 JAN 1960
Decaption Note:
Disposition Action: RELEASED
Disposition Approved on Date:
Disposition Authority: CunninFX
Disposition Case Number: n/a
Disposition Comment: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Date: 28 MAY 2004
Disposition Event:
Disposition History: n/a
Disposition Reason:
Disposition Remarks:
Document Number: 1975NATO03260
Document Source: ADS
Document Unique ID: 00
Drafter: n/a
Enclosure: n/a
Executive Order: 11652 GDS
Errors: n/a
Film Number: n/a
From: NATO
Handling Restrictions: n/a
Image Path:
ISecure: 1
Legacy Key: link1975/newtext/t19750698/abbrzkfnf.tel
Line Count: 225
Locator: TEXT ON-LINE
Office: n/a
Original Classification: SECRET
Original Handling Restrictions: n/a
Original Previous Classification: n/a
Original Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Page Count: 5
Previous Channel Indicators:
Previous Classification: SECRET
Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Reference: A) STATE 110784; B) USNATO 3231 DTG 111820Z JUNE 75
Review Action: RELEASED, APPROVED
Review Authority: CunninFX
Review Comment: n/a
Review Content Flags:
Review Date: 09 APR 2003
Review Event:
Review Exemptions: n/a
Review History: RELEASED <09 APR 2003 by BoyleJA>; APPROVED <16 SEP 2003 by CunninFX>
Review Markings:

Margaret P. Grafeld
Declassified/Released
US Department of State
EO Systematic Review
06 JUL 2006

Review Media Identifier:
Review Referrals: n/a
Review Release Date: n/a
Review Release Event: n/a
Review Transfer Date:
Review Withdrawn Fields: n/a
Secure: OPEN
Status: NATIVE
Subject: MBFR: TIME BETWEEN PHASES: SPC MEETING JUNE 12
TAGS: PARM, NATO
To: STATE
SECDEF INFO MBFR VIENNA
BONN
LONDON
USNMR SHAPE
USCINCEUR

Type: TE

Markings: Margaret P. Grafeld Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 06 JUL 2006